

REMARKS

Claims 1-25 are pending in the application. Claims 1-25 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,246,981 to Papineni et al. ("Papineni") in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,748,841 to Morin et al. ("Morin").

It is respectfully submitted that the above claim rejections are legally deficient because under 35 U.S.C. § 103(c), the Papineni reference is not available as prior art against the claimed invention. More specifically, under amended provision 35 U.S.C. §103(c), commonly assigned applications that are available as prior art only under 35 U.S.C. §102(e), (f) or (g) are no longer applicable as prior art to the claimed invention in an obviousness rejection. In particular, 35 U.S.C. §103(c) was amended to recite:

Subject matter developed by another person, which qualifies as prior art only under one or more of subsections (e), (f) and (g) of section 102 of this title, shall not preclude patentability under this section where the subject matter and the claimed invention were, at the time the invention was made owned by the same person or subject to an obligation of assignment to the same person.

(Emphasis added). See also 1233 OG 55-56 (April 11, 2000), which describes guidelines to implement amended §103(c).

Further, as set forth in MPEP 706.02(l)(1), for applications filed on or after November 29, 1999 (including continued prosecution applications (CPA) filed under 37 CFR 1.53(d)), subject matter that was 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior art under former 35 U.S.C. 103 is now disqualified as prior art against the claimed invention if that subject matter and the claimed invention were, at the time the invention was made, owned by the same person or subject to an

obligation of assignment to the same person. The mere filing of a continuing application on or after November 29, 1999, with the required evidence of common ownership, will serve to exclude commonly owned 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior art that was applied, or could have been applied, in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103 in the parent application.

Here, the provisions of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) are applicable to disqualify the Papineni reference as prior art against the claimed inventions for the following reasons.

First, Papineni is available as prior art to the present application *only* under 35 U.S.C. §102(e). Indeed, the Papineni patent was issued on June 12, 2001, which is *after* the effective filing date of Applicants' current application, August 13, 1999.

Secondly, a CPA for Applicants' current application is being filed concurrently herewith. Therefore, the CPA filing date is *after* the effective date of November 29, 1999.

Thirdly, for purposes of *common ownership*, the current application and the Papineni patent were, at the time the invention of the current application was made, owned by the same entity, International Business Machines Corporation.

Therefore, the amended provision 103(c) is applicable and Examiner cannot rely on Papineni to support the current claim rejections under 35 U.S.C. 103(a). Accordingly, the claim rejections under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are *legally deficient on their face and, consequently, must be withdrawn.*

In view of the foregoing remarks, it is respectfully submitted that all the claims now pending in the application are in condition for allowance. Early and favorable reconsideration of the case is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Frank DeRosa
Reg. No. 43,584
Attorney for Applicant(s)

F. Chau & Associates, LLP
1900 Hempstead TnPk.
East Meadow, NY 11553
TEL.: (516) 357-0091
FAX: (516) 357-0092